1 2	STEVEN W. MYHRE Acting United States Attorney District of Nevada	
3	MARK E. WOOLF LINDSY M. ROBERTS Assistant United States Attorneys 501 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Suite 1100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: 702-388-6336 Email: Mark.Woolf@usdoj.gov Lindsy.Roberts@usdoj.gov	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	Attorneys for the United States.	
9		
10		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
13	ELOISE HERRON,)
14	Plaintiff,) Case No.
15	v.) NOTICE OF REMOVAL
16 17	MISTER JONATHAN JACKSON, III; BUDGET RENT A CAR SYSTEM, INC.; JAMES SMITH,)))
18	Defendants.))
19)
20	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2679(d)(2), 1346(b)(1), 1442(a)(1), and 1446, the United	
21	States of America, on behalf of itself and Federal Defendant Mister Jonathan Jackson, III	
22	("Jackson"), a federal employee acting in the course and scope of federal employment or office	
23	at the time of the subject incident, removes this case to the United States District Court for the	
24	District of Nevada. The grounds for removal are set forth below.	
25	On August 7, 2017, Plaintiff commenced this action in the District Court, Clark County	
26	Nevada, as Case No. A-17-759559-C. Plaintiff alleges that on or about November 30, 2015,	
27	Jackson negligently operated his vehicle which resulted in damages to Plaintiff (Plaintiff's	
28	complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit A). On September 26, 2017, Defendant James Smith	

1 filed an answer asserting cross-claims against Jackson (attached as Exhibit B). On November 7, 2 2017, Defendant Budget Rent A Car System, Inc. filed an answer (attached as Exhibit C). 3 This action is being removed pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, which provides in 4 pertinent part: 5 Upon Certification by the Attorney General that the defendant employee was acting within the scope of his office or employment at the time of the incident out of which 6 the claim arose, any civil action or proceeding commenced upon such claim in a State court shall be removed without bond at any time before trial by the Attorney General 7 to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place in which the action or proceeding is pending. Such action or proceeding shall be 8 deemed to be an action or proceeding brought against the United States . . ., and the United States shall be substituted as the party defendant. 9 10 28 U.S.C. § 2679(d)(2). The Attorney General has delegated to United States Attorneys the 11 authority to certify that a federal employee was acting in the course and scope of his 12 employment at the time of the incident at issue. 28 C.F.R. § 15.4. The Acting United States 13 Attorney for the District of Nevada has certified that Jackson was acting in the course and scope 14 of federal employment or office at the time of the incident that is the subject of Plaintiff's 15 Complaint. The Acting United States Attorney's Certification of Scope of Employment is 16 attached hereto as Exhibit D, and is also attached as an exhibit to the concurrently filed Motion 17 for Substitution. Additionally, federal district courts have exclusive jurisdiction for tort claims 18 arising from the negligent or wrongful acts or omissions of federal employees acting within the 19 scope of their employment or office. See 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)(1). 20 Further, 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1) provides in pertinent part: 21 "A civil action ... that is commenced in a State court and that is against or directed to any of the following may be removed by them to the district court of the United States 22 for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending: (1) The United States or any agency thereof or any officer (or any person acting under that officer) of 23 the United States or of any agency thereof, in an official or individual capacity, for or relating to any act under color of such office " 24 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1). Section 1442(a)(1) provides for a "broad" grant of removal jurisdiction 25 26 and is not given a "narrow, grudging interpretation." Nationwide Investors v. Miller, 793 F.2d 27 1044, 1046 (9th Cir. 1986) (citing Willingham v. Morgan, 395 U.S. 402, 407 (1969)). Under

Section 1442(a)(1), federal court jurisdiction need not even be apparent from the face of the

28

Case 2:17-cv-03051-GMN-EJY Document 1 Filed 12/12/17 Page 3 of 4

complaint itself. See Jefferson Cnty., Alabama v. Acker, 527 U.S. 423 (1999); Mesa v. California, 489 U.S. 121 (1989). Accordingly, the United States gives notice that the above-referenced action, commenced in the District Court, Clark County, Nevada, as Case No. A-17-759559-C, is now removed to the United States District Court for the District of Nevada. The United States does not, by filing this notice, waive service of process or any other defenses available under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b) or other applicable law. A copy of this notice will be served promptly on Plaintiff and all other appearing parties. Respectfully submitted this 12th day of December 2017. STEVEN W. MYHRE Acting United States Attorney /s/ Mark E. Woolf MARK E. WOOLF Assistant United States Attorney

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 2 I, Mark E. Woolf, certify that the **NOTICE OF REMOVAL** was served on all parties 3 this date via the Court's Electronic Case Filing system and in the manner specified below. 4 **U.S. Mail & Electronic Mail:** 5 Joshua L. Benson, Esq. 4795 South Durango Drive 6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89147 jbenson@glenlerner.com 7 Attorney for Plaintiff 8 Deborah L. Elsasser, Esq. 9 400 N. Stephanie St., Suite 260 Henderson, Nevada 89014 10 Delsass1@progressive.com 11 Attorney for Defendant and Cross-Claimant James A. Smith 12 Alan W. Westbrook 1701 W. Charleston, Suite 200 13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 awestbrook@perrywestbrook.com 14 Attorney for Budget Rent A Car System, Inc. 15 Dated this 12th day of December 2017. 16 /s/ Mark E. Woolf 17 MARK E. WOOLF Assistant United States Attorney 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28